

A reign of terror is not the kind of rule under which right action and deliberate judgment are possible.—WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

Republican Policy Triumphs

Leaders of the Party Attest the Wisdom of the
President's Administration.

LINCOLN AND MCKINLEY

Comparison of the Presidential Campaigns Thirty-six
Years Ago and Now.

ART OF HUMBUGGERY

Genuine Anti-Imperialists Not Caught in the
Kansas City Net.

NO MAN CAN TAKE HIS PLACE.

**President McKinley's Re-Election Demanded for the Good of
the Country.**

[By Hon. DAVID B. HENDERSON of Iowa, Speaker of National House of Representatives.]

No man can take the place of President McKinley, and when the ballots are counted in November, the sensible people of the country will demonstrate to the world that no man will be allowed to take his place.

The name of Hamilton suggests three thoughts to me that may be appropriate for 1900: First, a strong government; second, a just government; third, a protective government. In this great world of ours, full of powerful nations, aggressive in their governments, this nation as a government must be strong to take care of our people. No government can be strong that is not just. We cannot hold the love or support of our people unless we are just in the interpretation and enactment of our laws. No government will answer the purposes of the American people that is not protective. These three principles were the cardinal ones of that great statesman and patriot, Alexander Hamilton.

PROTECTION BY THE GOVERNMENT.

This government must protect capital and labor and give each a fair chance. It must protect rich and poor, black and white—and brown—old and young, men and women, and the children, too. Unless we have a government strong enough to protect our citizens everywhere the flag floats we shall fail in our duty to ourselves and the world about us. It must be a government that will protect its citizens whether in the heart of Chicago or in the heart of China. These doctrines I take as the watchwords of the hour. I would have men elected who would act them like McKinley, as

well as believe in them. I want the people to elect such men because I believe in them thoroughly. I therefore say, elect William McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt.

VITAL ISSUES OF THE HOUR.

Militarism a Bugbear—Our Policy in the Philippines and in China Entirely Justified.

[By HON. CUSHMAN K. DAVIS, United States Senator from Minnesota.]

This campaign is portentous. Others have been conducted on few issues, economic or moral. In this one, the Democratic party and its candidate means the reversal of every policy, domestic and foreign, monetary, financial, protective and expansive, which has made the administration of President McKinley one of the most glorious in our history by the splendor of its military and naval achievements, by its revival of dying industries, by its financial legislation, by its making the United States the first money power in the world, by its extension of our sovereignty, and by our advancement to the forefront of international influence.

The measures and policies which have wrought these imposing political transformations are denounced and their abrogation is demanded by the declaration of Democratic principles made at Kansas City.

This declaration does not denounce the administration of President McKinley for its failures, it condemns it for its achievements. It declares them to be destructive of true prosperity and subversive of our institutions. It demands that the gold standard shall be abolished, and that protection to American industries shall cease.

PLAN FIRST LOWERING OF FLAG.

For the first time the sovereignty of the United States over territory held by an unquestionable title is to be abandoned and the flag lowered, and that, too, in capitulation to a flagrant insurrection against its authority. All this, and more than this, is demanded by the Democratic party as a reason for its investiture with power, and is promised to the American people in case power is given to do it. Such demands, such promises, such threats, such consequences will receive the most considerate condemnation of the people.

No Democratic platform, no Democratic speaker expresses any satisfaction with our triumphs in war, or with the abounding prosperity of our people, or with our international ascendancy. How can they rejoice in a prosperity which falsifies every prediction they made four years ago, and the approval of which now would refute every claim that they can possibly make for their political restoration?

The present administration has kept the faith in which the American people invested it with power, has performed every act to which it was pledged, and has fulfilled every expectation which has arisen from sudden events which were foreseen four years ago.

IMPERIALISM NOT THE ISSUE.

The real, the paramount question before the American people is not imperialism. It is whether these conditions and the policies which have produced them are to be abandoned, or even put to the chance of abandonment in the pursuit of—theories, I was about to say, but not of theories—in the repetition of experiments which have always proved disastrous in the very respects in which our prosperity is now so abounding, for it is never to be forgotten that the Kansas City platform, while it denounces expansion and what it calls imperialism, also specifically condemns the policy of protection as enforced by the statute which was passed immediately after the inauguration of President McKinley; condemns our financial policy and the gold standard under which money has become more abundant than it ever was before and interest lower, and twice demands the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1.

McKINLEY ON TRUSTS.

The President laid the subject of trusts before Congress, and an amendment to the constitution was proposed by the Republicans in the House of Representatives during the last session. It provided that "Congress shall have power to define, regulate, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise. The several states may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States."

Here was such an opportunity as the Democracy had never had to demonstrate the sincerity of its declarations. The amendment came to a vote. The Democrats (with one or two exceptions) voted solidly against it. The Republicans (with one or two exceptions) voted for it. The Democrats could have completed the two-thirds vote required by the constitution. They did not. They voted against the proposition with practical unanimity.

STATE SOVEREIGNTY INVOKED.

And upon what ground? Upon the ground that the proposed amendment would diminish the existing sovereignty of the states upon this subject. This is an assertion by them that it is a subject of state jurisdiction under the constitution, as it is, except as to interstate and foreign commerce. The Supreme court has defined the limitations of legislation. The legislation which the Democrats vaguely promise would be void when tested by their own arguments and votes upon the amendment. In other words, the Democrats purpose, and have voted, to leave the power of legislation just where it now is, while the Republican party proposed to vest it in Congress to the fullest extent necessary.

The administration of President McKinley has done its full duty to this country in the matter of the Boer war, and it owes no duty to any nation excepting the United States.

DEMOCRATS SILENT ABOUT CHINA.

The Democratic party was silent respecting our relations with China, because to declare opinions upon that subject which the American people would receive with contempt and spurn with disgust would cause the broomstick ghost of imperialism and militarism to vanish in an instant. So to speak would annihilate those "paramount issues," because it would admit that even the blind, when told, can perceive, even if they cannot see it, that the status, the occupation, and the sovereignty of the United States in the Philippines are at this moment and in this great crisis of civilization commanding and absolutely indispensable. They vindicate the wisdom of holding those possessions, unless the United States is to recede to the shores of the American continent, become herself a little China, cancel herself as a factor in the great civilizing and commercial change in the Asiatic Orient, an event fully as important as the discovery of America by Columbus.

There are few events in our diplomatic and military history more honorable than the consummate skill, the wise conservatism and the unflinching courage by which the administration of President McKinley relieved our legation and at the same time maintained proper relations with the Chinese empire.

The policy of the United States as to China should, in my opinion, be this: It must rescue its citizens. It must exact indemnity for all injuries to their persons or property. It will insist that China shall observe all treaty stipulations, and that, under any and all conditions of sovereignty, cession, or foreign ascendancy, the open door shall remain open. We shall use no military force for conquest, and have no concert with any European power, except to rescue our citizens and theirs.

COVET NO CHINESE TERRITORY.

We covet no Chinese territory and we will acquire none. We desire no territorial sphere of influence. We will give no approval or support, physical, moral or sentimental, to the dismemberment of China, or to the extinc-

tion of her sovereignty by the acquisition of spheres of influence by any European power.

I look for a regeneration of China as the result of the convulsions she is now suffering. It will come to pass not by the partition of that mighty and immemorial empire, but by its full entry into commercial relations with the other nations of the world. The process will not be a long one. It has been going on for fifty years, and has become more perfect and extensive every year. When fully completed the United States will be the greatest participant in that trade of the Pacific which Humboldt predicted more than seventy-five years ago would be the greatest commerce that land and sea have ever known. We need cross but one ocean to grasp the "wealth of Ormuz and of Ind." Europe must traverse four seas to share it. We can produce everything which that insatiable market can absorb, just as now we are producing and exporting our fabrics, textile, metallic and miscellaneous to every market in the world, as the direct result of Republican economic policies put in force during our civil war and steadily persisted in by that party ever since.

This is manifest destiny; it is written by an auspicious astrologer upon the sky of a visible future. It will give 15,000,000 of people to our states of the Pacific coast; it will open a career to the talents of aspiring youth and in every way carry the United States far along on that course of national grandeur for which I believe the nation was ordained.

PARAMOUNT ISSUES ARE ECONOMIC.

Imperialism is not the paramount issue of the campaign and cannot be made so. The adjustment of any question as to the Philippines is to be considered after rebellion against the sovereignty and authority of the United States has been put down. The paramount issues this year are financial and economic. Shall the anti-protection party of 16 to 1 be put in power to advance its principles by the enormous powers and executive influence in case Mr. Bryan is elected and win the first engagement in a campaign the next battle of which will be for the control of both Houses of Congress?

The question for the plain people is, do they wish, with the instructions of a bitter experience fresh and deep in their memories, to change or submit to the chance of change that abounding prosperity which came with the election of President McKinley—a prosperity which no Democratic platform or speaker denies nor dare not rejoice in or even allude to? Aguinaldo can wait until the American people take "a bond of fate," if necessary, by annihilating for the preservation of their own domestic interests the political combination which is at the same time their enemy and the aider and abettor of the Tagal rebels.

OUR DUTY IN THE PHILIPPINES.

The immediate duty of this government as to the Philippines is to maintain its sovereignty and to crush rebellion against it. What its constitutional powers and limitations are can be more profitably discussed and considered after the authority of the United States shall have been firmly established. I do not believe that the constitution contains any disabling inhibition which will prevent this government from governing those islands as their best interests may demand, and according to the capacities of their people. No such difficulties intervened in the administration of Louisiana, Florida, or the territory which we acquired from Mexico. Congress legislated at the last session in regard to the government of Alaska in some particulars entirely unwarranted by the constitution, if the disabling construction placed upon it by our opponents is correct. There are certain large and general considerations, however, which, to my mind, demonstrate that the authority to govern these dependencies is vested in Congress subject to no disabling limitations of certain provisions of the constitution,

which, because they are inapplicable to such a situation, never could have been designed by the framers to apply to it.

BRYAN SHRINKS FROM THE RESPONSIBILITY.

In declaring that he will convene Congress for these purposes Mr. Bryan shrinks from the logical consequences of his own position. If elected President of the United States he will become Commander-in-Chief of the army and navy, conducting a war which he and the platform upon which he stands assert to be a "criminal aggression" against a people who ought to be independent. As such Commander-in-Chief, holding to such principle, he would have the right to withdraw every man from the Philippines, cause our squadron to sail out from Manila Bay, to evacuate entirely the archipelago, and—to use his own language—leave their people to work out their own destiny. As President he could recognize the existence and independence of the Philippine republic. A bold man, holding such views as these and with such powers, would say that he intended to use them, but there Mr. Bryan halts and recoils. He purposes to throw the responsibility upon Congress, well knowing that with a Republican Senate and House of Representatives no such action as he proposes to recommend would receive the least sanction.

MILITARISM A BUGBEAR.

I shall say but little of this bugbear of militarism. We are crippled to-day by the inadequacy of our military force in performing our manifest duties as to our people in China. The events in that empire demonstrate, as did our unprepared condition at the beginning of the Spanish war, how suddenly and unexpectedly crises may arise which will call for the exercise of our military power and find it entirely lacking. A nation of 75,000,000 of free people, vast in extent, need have no fear that an empire will be erected upon the ruins of the republic by the scattered forces of an army of 100,000 men.

But if an increased army leads to militarism, so does an increased navy, and yet we hear no word of protest from the Democratic party against that, because such a protest would be carrying the argument too far; and yet a navy, in the establishment of militarism or imperialism, could reduce our coast cities, could attack Washington, could hold the arsenals and strategic points on all our shores, and do as much as and possibly more than an army could toward the overthrow of this government or the change of its form. A small Brazilian navy did this once as to Brazil and attempted it again. The truth is, there is no danger from either of these great arms of our military service. They are the right hand and the left hand of our power and defense at home and abroad. Their officers and men are as loyal as Grant, and Sherman, and Sheridan, and Farragut, and Porter, and Worden, and their soldiers and sailors were in their time.

THE PARTY'S MAGNIFICENT HISTORY.

If the existence of the Republican party should be closed to-day its history would be that of the nation saved, of a protective system under which the United States has become the greatest manufacturing nation in the world, of a general industrial development which sustains 75,000,000 people, of a financial system which has created an unimpeachable credit, of all the blessings which civilization can confer upon humanity.

But its existence will not end this year, nor for many years to come. Its august mission is not yet performed. So long as it represents, as it does now, the national prosperity and honor, national growth, with renown and right, national prestige in the relations of the United States with foreign powers as the result of the neutrality of a puissant nation, safe in the enjoyment of all its rights, because of its manifest ability to cause other nations to respect them, the Republican party will shape the destinies of the American people.

PROSPERITY COMES WITH REPUBLICANISM.

Good Times Inevitably Follow the Guidance and the Policies of the Republican Party.

[By Hon. J. P. DOLLIVER, United States Senator from Iowa.]

The subject of prosperity would be one entirely non-partisan if it were not for the fact that good times in the United States have got so completely mixed up with the Republican party that it is almost impossible to separate them in the public thought. By far too little attention is given in this world to a study of the blessings which surround us, while our troubles, the disasters and adversities of our experience, never lack either for orator to embellish them or for audiences to appreciate them.

The chairman of the National Democratic committee evidently had this side of human nature in view when, the other day, in predicting Mr. Bryan's success, he said that the workingmen of the United States who voted for McKinley four years ago could be counted for Bryan now. Four years ago, he said, they voted the Republican ticket under the impression that if they lost their jobs they would have difficulty in finding others. Now, Senator Jones argues, owing to the universal employment of labor, they will perceive that if they lose the job they now have it will be easy to find another.

CHANGE IN THE LAST FOUR YEARS.

Almost every man recognizes that since March 4, 1897, the conditions of American life have undergone a change which may almost be compared, without irreverence, to a resurrection from the dead. I have heard many attempts made to account for this. In the spring of 1896 I conferred upon William McKinley a title which his administration has fully lived up to. It was at a time when the State of Iowa was presenting to the country as a Presidential candidate one of the most famous and useful members of the Senate of the United States. I had come back from a Western State populated largely by old Iowa men, and in trying to explain to our people why everybody was for McKinley I told my friend, Walter Wellman, that the whole Northwest seemed to have its heart set on McKinley and to look on him as the "advance agent of prosperity," a phrase which subsequently passed into the proverbial literature of the campaign.

The President put his signature on the tariff law of 1897, which in the years to come will bear the honored name, now left to us as a part of our Republican inheritance, of Nelson Dingley of Maine. That law was adopted by Congress against the written protest filed by the diplomatic representatives of nineteen different foreign nations. It went through by the almost unanimous consent of the only nation for whose benefit it was framed—the United States of America. I count that great statute as the corner-stone of the national prosperity which followed close upon its enactment.

In 1892 no other question was discussed. To-day the Democratic party runs away from the tariff question in which the wages and employment of every American citizen are involved, attempts to decoy us across the Pacific Ocean, and to hide its record and plans for the future in a network of cant and hypocrisy about the Declaration of Independence. The Republican party stands ready to meet them, either on the main land or the high seas, but while we propose to meet them, while we propose to whip them wherever we find them, we recognize that the real field of this battle is here and not on the other side of the world. We fight for the rights of American labor, now everywhere employed, for the comfort of the scattered homesteads.

MAINTAINING STANDARD OF VALUE.

Hardly less important, and in the judgment of many, even more important as a foundation of national prosperity, was the solemn determination of the American people recorded on the election day in 1896 to maintain the standard of value on which all contracts of the people were drawn and all their business transacted. In their victory of that year party lines were in a large measure lost, so that the verdict was in a high sense a popular

verdict rather than a partisan one. The strength of our institutions has been increased by the notice then served upon mischief-makers, agitators, candidates, and political leaders that whoever threatens the integrity of American business has to settle his account, not with a political party, but with the united conscience, judgment, and character of the whole people. Does anybody suppose that the author of that obsolete volume called "The First Battle," which four years ago sold readily for \$3.50 and can now be purchased at any second-hand book store for 25 cents, would have telephoned the Kansas City convention that he would not take their nomination unless they stated again their intention to overthrow the gold standard, in the words of his war cry of the last campaign, if he regarded any other issue as paramount to the Chicago program of 1896?

DEMOCRATIC TALK INSINCERE.

The world is so arranged that every masquerade of false pretenses, trying to do business upon a high moral scale, sooner or later comes to a point along its line of march where it can distinctly hear the laughter of gods and men. Such a point was reached at Kansas City when "Pitchfork" Tillman was selected on account of his voice to read the Declaration of Independence, with its sublime precepts about the equality of men and the ultimate basis of human government. On February 26th last I heard Mr. Tillman boast in the Senate that his people had openly nullified the law of the land, treating the great amendments of the constitution as null and void, and with bloodshed and fraud, for which he offered no apology, had driven more than one-half of the population of South Carolina from any participation whatever, either in the government of the United States or in the government of the community in which they were born. Until Mr. Bryan shall stand up somewhere before the American people and, in an audible tone of voice, utter one word of manly disapproval of the crime against civil liberty, which, in the undisputed Democratic communities of the United States, has left ten millions of people helpless and outcast before the law, I, for one, intend to treat his noisy declarations on the subject of equal rights as unfit for the respect of the American people.

McKINLEY'S SPLENDID ADMINISTRATION.

With such a hand as President McKinley's on the helm of our affairs, the nation, troubled and perplexed as seldom before, goes steadily forward, without doubt or fear in all the great departments of the national life. Our leader sits in the executive office surrounded by trusted counselors, with his eyes on the map of the world and the fixed purpose in his heart that neither loss nor harm shall come to our people in any quarter of the earth. He has appealed to the patriotic manhood of America to stand firm and unmoved under the responsibilities of our day and generation.

The first answer has come from far off Oregon, where the majority of 1896 was multiplied by five. Vermont will follow, and then Maine, and the united voice of every other State, except those Democratic strongholds where love for the constitution and devotion to the Declaration of Independence have at last openly abolished the republican form of government. Whatever danger lies in our path, however rough the road which we must travel, let us keep our faith strong in our country and in our countrymen. Let us be sure there is a guidance in the affairs of men higher than our poor human wisdom, which will make the dawn of the approaching century radiant with the promise of civil liberty not only for the helpless races within our own borders but for the scattered millions throughout all our possessions in all the seas.

LINCOLN AND McKINLEY.

The Presidential Campaigns Thirty-six Years Ago and Now.

Thirty-six years ago in the City of Chicago, in the last days of August, assembled the representatives of the Democratic party, and they protested

then as they are exclaiming now, that the President of the United States was carrying on wantonly, unconstitutionally, contrary to the faith and hope of the fathers of the Republic, in violation of the fundamental principles of our government, a vindictive, horrible, imperialistic, devilish and totally hopeless war, and that the perfidy of the President was wholly at fault, and he, spattered with the blood of brethren, defied humanity and disgraced the name and smirched the fame of America, and was a baboonish imbecile, incompetent for public affairs, rushing the country headlong to ruin and jesting about it.

OLD DEMOCRATIC PREDICTIONS.

The Democratic party then, as now, asserted that the war was not progressing to a victory for the Union, but going the other way.

Mr. Vallandigham, the master spirit of his party in the Chicago convention, because he had been ordered out of the country by President Lincoln, insisted upon the invincibility of those who were in arms to destroy the Union, and the impossibility of overcoming the military power of the Southern States, and wrote an argument that Grant was not pressing Lee but that Lee was pressing Grant, that the national army could not take Richmond and was beaten back toward the sea.

The Democratic convention passed a resolution declaring the war to restore the Union a "failure," and demanding a convention of all the States to compromise away the authority and integrity of the Union. The Democratic party in the City of Chicago not only wrote the word "failure" over the war, but charged it to the bloodthirsty incapacity of Abraham Lincoln. This was even more redolent and rabid in the speeches and prevalent conversation of the convention than in the platform. The official literature, bad as it was, was a marked modification of the general spirit of the occasion.

WHAT COST LINCOLN HIS LIFE.

In the campaign following, in the Northwestern States, particularly and especially in Ohio and Indiana, the partisan copperhead Chicago platform Democrats carried, at many of their meetings in the copperhead counties, white flags in token of abject submission to the Southern Confederacy. Their weekly papers in the counties were malicious beyond all that is now believable by those who have "malice toward none and charity for all," toward the author of that revered phrase.

President Lincoln was charged with blood guiltiness, and those passions were aroused and intensified that culminated in the tragedy that closed Mr. Lincoln's life.

The current opinion is that the re-election of Abraham Lincoln—and that is conceded to be the event that decided the fortunes of war in favor of the Union—was almost a matter of course. It is held that the martyred President won his second election almost without an effort. The fact was far otherwise. The Democratic party made a determined and even desperate struggle. The majority of Mr. Lincoln in 1864 in the State of New York was less than the majority for McClellan in New Jersey. The majorities for Lincoln in New Hampshire and Connecticut were less than 3,000 in each state, and Pennsylvania was carried for Lincoln outside the army vote by less than 6,000.

Fancy the infernal howl that would go up now about imperialism if it were arranged that the vote of the army in the Philippines and China should be taken in the Presidential election. The troops sent home by General Sheridan and General Meade from the valleys of the Shenandoah and the Rappahannock increased Lincoln's Pennsylvania majority to about 15,000.

DEMOCRATIC PRAISE FOR LINCOLN.

Mr. Lincoln for a time believed that he would be defeated, and wrote a letter to that effect, which he sealed and gave to Gideon Welles, the Secretary of the Navy, to keep for him. It was not to be opened until after the election. In that letter, written in what he believed to be the shadow of

defeat cast before the event, he promised if beaten to spend the time between election day and the inauguration day of his opponent in helping save the Union, because the platform upon which McClellan was running, in fact, though he had repudiated it in phrase, would make it impossible for him as President to save the Union.

The attacks upon Mr. Lincoln during this campaign—and that which Democrats are saying of Lincoln now show how fast and far the nation has traveled in the right way—were of unceasing and astounding virulence. Let us be grateful that Democrats of this generation think so well of Mr. Lincoln, praise his name, commend his statesmanship and approve even of his principles and war policy. It arouses recollections that provoke melancholy reflections when Mr. Bryan quotes Lincoln and lifts up his strained utterances in eulogy—but let us “accept the gifts the gods provide,” and “praise God from whom all blessings flow.” The fact that Lincoln’s stature towers beside that of Washington may yet save the country, if the extravagance of adulation does not weaken the appreciation of services inestimable.

THEIR ATTACKS UPON McKINLEY.

But the people of the United States should remember that the Democratic party is warring upon William McKinley in 1900, precisely as they warred upon Lincoln in 1864, making many of the same charges in the very same words, even to the “imperialism,” for their favorite epithet of disrespect was in the mock title “Abrahamas I.,” and there was a great deal of an unprintable character.

The Bryan Democracy say now that the United States is at war to-day with the Philippine nation, and that the war is a failure now, and they use the same language about it that they used in the time of Lincoln, and they charged that war to him just as they charge this one to McKinley. They said the Lincoln war, as they called it, and they regarded it as a happy thought to spell his name “Linkhorn,” was a wicked war and without hope, just as they charge President McKinley with the responsibility for the Tagal war, and say that it is perfidious against an “ally” and brutal, and that a favorable termination is not possible. Those who remember what the Democratic writers, speakers and talkers—reference to the copperhead part of the party, and they were usually in control—made the theme and burden of their utterances in ’64, find what they are saying now of President McKinley an old, old story.

They said then that the war was caused by Lincoln’s refusal to compromise, and was malignant toward the foe. One of Lincoln’s special defamers, distinguished now as a brazen trumpet blown each day for Bryan, regarded Lincoln’s murder humorously, and indulged in grotesque speculation about the judgment of God upon him, four months after his death.

WHAT HISTORY WILL SAY OF HIM.

The time will come and it will not be long delayed, when William McKinley will be greeted by all rational mankind as ever faithful, true and brave, noble, upright, of perfect probity, of absolute courage as a subordinate officer on the battlefield, and as President in the Cabinet.

What history will say of him will be worthy to be written in letters of gold.

The war of this day and of a few months and two years ago, is small comparatively, and far away, but the cause is just, humane, according to the traditions, the events and the dignity of the American nation. President McKinley walks in the footsteps of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson—of the great line of Presidents of Virginia, Tennessee, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois—one does not need to name them—the world knows them—and he upholds the standard unstained, and as Webster said, “full high advanced,” of the great Republic.

LINCOLN AND McKINLEY COMPARED.

He will leave it when he leaves the White House, whenever that is, greater and better than he found it; and no man can read clearly the life of

Lincoln and fairly the life of McKinley, and capable of distinguishing the difference between the true patriotism and false pretension without being enlightened—unless the light has failed to guide him—that those who upheld Lincoln in '64 must uphold McKinley now.

The cause that is now tried is hardly less momentous than then. The prosperity, the nationality, the character, the spirit of the people—the popular instinct that is in the intelligence that insures the “capacity for self-government” is now to be tested by the highest standards, weighed, measured, to withstand one of the strains that our form of government contemplates; and one would be of little faith and fertile in apprehension who did not believe, and indeed in his soul know, that there is to be a triumph for all causes that are honorable and of good report, in the re-election of President McKinley.

The approaching victory will be scarcely less renowned than that of 1864, for the same characteristic cause, the defense of the national life and glory, is committed to the Republicans now as then. The redemption of the land from a cloud that would blight the splendor that has been brightened in the four years just past will place the victory of McKinley in 1900 on lines as elevated and as luminous as that of Lincoln in 1864.

AT CHICAGO IN 1864 AND 1900.

Now, 1864 was the year and Chicago the city, and the last days of August the days that the war for the nation was by the Democratic party denounced a failure.

Behold in a glorious vision, a magical, mighty change! It is the march of the Grand Army through Chicago, with such a triumph as Rome never gave her legions when she welcomed them from victorious wars. It was the celebration of the crowded victories for the cause of Lincoln that immediately followed the Democratic proclamation of the decline and downfall of all he represented.

Look around over this continental country to-day and see the monuments of glory, the mountains of prosperity, the free “life, liberty and pursuit of happiness” by people who, in less time than has elapsed since Lincoln left us, will number more than 100,000,000.

HEROES OF WAR AND PEACE.

Not since the days when the armies of the Potomac, the Tennessee, the Cumberland and the Ohio marched from Virginia across the long bridge before the national capitol, unfinished but majestic in superb incompleteness and soon to be crowned by the dome not unworthy to rise among the stars—not since the four armies marched up Pennsylvania avenue, on their left the unfinished monument of Washington, now the loftiest white shaft memorial of a great life that stands on the globe, has a grander army marched than that at the grand 1900 review.

Behold the march continuing by the then unfinished Treasury Department to salute before the White House the President of the United States—not, alas, Abraham Lincoln, whose work was done—dead since the triumphant return across the Potomac of the Grand Army of the Republic—a shining river of steel flowing back from the tremendous scenes of cementing the Union with the blood of the brave—the vast columns North and West, homeward bound to work of peace—the valiant Confederates who had fought against the course of the constellations across the sky, included too in the general triumph—all countrymen again, since Grant and Lee met “near Appomattox with its famous apple tree” and made the treaty written by Grant himself to be followed by the benediction of the hero, “let us have peace”—never has there been a pageant reviving such riches of memory, representative of splendid achievement and prophetic of the greater hereafter of our country as well as of the magnificent present—or one that was so replete with the pathos that tells the sad story of glory and kindles the pride of Americans into a flame, that consumes the Belittlers of the common

inheritance that is of the people and for them—the heroes of war came home to be heroes of peace, and welcomed those they had confronted on fields where there were two lines of fire to the House of the Fathers of the Republic, to stay under the stately roof and be at home forever,—for Father Abraham kept sacred in his heart and hand the constitution, and preserved it for all the nation. When he was dead those who praised him not knew him not.

LONG LIVE THE GRAND ARMY!

The armies that marched through stately Washington when the war was over, redeemed with the plow and the seed that brought golden harvest the fields that had been fallow, and North and South a million homes were made happy by the returning brave.

Long may the veterans of the Grand Army have their reunions and remember with full hearts those who fell on both sides on the memorable fields, where the volleyed thunders scattered in the opposing ranks Death and Immortality! Long live the Grand Army of the Republic and green and flowery be the graves of the dead, and forget not the story the name of the Grand Army tells—that it carries the flag and keeps step to the music of the Union, that grows grander and more thrilling as the years roll away.

MURAT HALSTEAD.

ART OF HUMBUGGERY.

Genuine Anti-Imperialists Not Caught in the Kansas City Net.

[By THEODORE W. NOYES, of *The Evening Star*, Washington, D. C.]

[Theodore W. Noyes, one of the editors and proprietors of *The Evening Star*, of Washington, D. C., in the early part of the present year, 1900, made a visit to the Philippine Islands, going by way of Hawaii, China and Japan. Mr. Noyes is not only a man of marked ability as an editor and writer, but he has traveled all over the civilized world and is a close observer. In the issue of his newspaper of August 10, 1900, there appeared an article on "Anti-Imperialism," which has attracted the widespread attention of political students and all who are most interested in the subject of expansion of our territory and commerce. His article will be read with intense interest during the impending campaign.]

There are anti-imperialists who have not assumed that role hypocritically for the purpose of revenue or revenge; who oppose without discrimination every tendency toward expansion by force and government without the consent of the governed; who denounce every insular acquisition by the nation in the belief that the republic's strength is in its compactness and homogeneity; and who resist any and every policy which involves the possibility of the creation of a large standing army or a powerful navy, and the fostering of the war spirit among the people of the republic.

Their platform, roughly outlined, would take the following shape:

ANTI-IMPERIALIST PLATFORM.

"1. We reaffirm and endorse Magna Charta, the Declaration of Independence, the Sixth and Eighth Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, the Historic Protest of Philip, King of the Pokanokets, the Seminoles' Reply and the Proclamations of Emilio Aguinaldo.

"2. We denounce and deplore the land greed, born of the spirit of imperialism, which has taken concrete shape in the annexation of Hawaii, Porto Rico and the Philippines, and we reaffirm the vigorous denunciations by statesmen now dead of the unconstitutional and imperialistic acquisition and government of Louisiana; of Florida, with the preceding and accompanying despotic outrages upon the natives and the Spaniards; of the land wrong by a hateful war of conquest from helpless Mexico, and of non-contiguous Alaska.

"3. We demand abandonment by the United States of Hawaii, the Philippines, Porto Rico and unsettled and imperially ruled Alaska, and independence for their people.

"4. We denounce the Republican party for its bold, unblushing, systematic and defiant imperialism and militarism in annexing and forcibly

and despotically ruling Alaska; in going to war with Spain; in annexing Hawaii; in making and voting to ratify the treaty of Paris; in annexing and governing Porto Rico and the Philippines and in sending troops to the Asiatic islands to crush under the iron heel of military despotism the Filipino patriots; and we demand the immediate cessation of the American war of criminal aggression in the Philippines."

SARCASM ABOUT LOUISIANA PURCHASE.

"5. We denounce the Democratic party for annexing Louisiana without the consent of its inhabitants and for governing that vast territory (larger than the annexing republic itself) as an empire on the principles of absolute despotism, without the consent of the governed and outside of the Constitution; for waging an unholy war of conquest against Mexico; for "pushing President McKinley into the war with Spain," according to its own boastful confession; and for working, through its recognized leader, W. J. Bryan, for the ratification of the treaty of Paris, well knowing the infamous criminality of that instrument, thus deliberately endangering the stability of the republic, with no excuse save the low, unworthy purpose of securing a supposed partisan advantage.

"6. We denounce militarism with its instruments of tyranny, a standing army and a navy and its baleful influence upon the youth of the republic in developing land hunger and blood thirst. We demand that the United States withdraw within itself; as soon as practicable disband its army and destroy or convert to peaceful uses its navy, those fruitful breeders of strife. We approve the spirit of Jefferson's recommendation in 1802 that the United States navy be stored in a dry dock at Washington for safety and economy and destruction by the elements. We denounce any extension of the United States into non-contiguous territory in either hemisphere, for the reason that it may lead to quarrels with our neighbors and bloodshed. We protest against any act or omission which by any possibility may lead to war, except in self defense. For this reason we denounce the Kansas City convention's indirect pledge to intervene between Great Britain and the Boers, Great Britain having already refused our offer of mediation and indicated that it would fight to the last Englishman against intervention. We should mind our own business, not burden ourselves with responsibility by encouraging further bloodshed in South Africa, and not declaim ourselves into a useless and hateful war with our kin across the sea.

NO DEMOCRATIC PROTECTORATE NEEDED.

"7. For the same reason we further and especially denounce the Democratic party (which poses as the exponent of anti-imperialism and anti-militarism) for the treacherous stab given under the cloak of hypocritical friendliness to our cause by the Kansas City platform in that it proposes for the Philippines a protectorate, that cunning device of despotic government to cloak imperialism, instead of granting them the full independence to which they are entitled; and in that it virtually declares a protectorate by the United States over the whole of Central and South America and unmistakably proposes to extend the strife-provoking Monroe doctrine to Asia, thus aiming blows at the foundation of the peaceful constitutional republic under which the whole fabric threatens to totter to its fall.

"8. We denounce government by protectorate as un-American and unconstitutional, never contemplated in their wildest dreams by the forefathers; as historically the preliminary process in the operation by which a monarchical power absorbs an independent principality, corresponding to the boa's preparatory saliva treatment of its victim before swallowing; as a strife-breeding, war-provoking arrangement, involving the United States in entangling foreign alliances or rather in the entanglement of foreign quarrels without the assistance of allies; as burdening the republic with heavy responsibilities and at the same time denying it the power and the control necessary to meet them; as fostering the military and meddlesome

spirit among American youth; as inflaming the imperialistic greed for land through foreign acquisitions and for gold through foreign trade; as rendering essential a large army and navy to the injury of the peaceful taxpayers, and as developing a spirit of rampant militarism and pointing straight to the overthrow of the republic.

A STABLE GOVERNMENT WITHOUT CONSENT.

"9. We denounce the Democratic proposition to delay indefinitely independence for the Filipinos, on the pretext of first establishing there a stable government imposed upon them by us without their consent.

"10. We denounce the method of construing the Constitution proposed by the Democratic party, which would make of the Philippines instantan an integral part of the Union and thus prevent forever their separation or secession from the United States and their enjoyment of an independent government.

"11. We declare that the government of our foreign acquisitions would be safer under the Republican program of treatment as "territory belonging to the United States" (a status recognized by the Constitution) to be governed under limitations stated in the Constitution and construed and precisely determined by the Supreme Court, than under the Democratic program of an imperial, war-provoking, unconstitutional protectorate, or under "a stable government" forcibly imposed by us on the Philippines as an integral part of the United States.

"12. But we declare that both parties are worthy only of our condemnation. Instead of suggesting and upholding any special form of government for the Philippines, whether a protectorate or otherwise, we demand that the United States immediately grant them full independence, leaving them free to determine for themselves the form of government most pleasing to them."

ARE MALAYS BETTER THAN NEGROES?

Will the Malay Filipino fare better at their hands than the North Carolina negro, whom the Constitution takes specifically under its protection, but whose consent or dissent in matters of government is not to be expressed except at peril of his life? Which organization represents more truly the rule of force that constitutes tyranny and imperialism, that fosters the empire and menaces the republic—the Red Shirts intimidating, murdering and disfranchising the North Carolina negroes, or our army in the Philippines, seeking to restore order and protecting peaceful Filipinos against the robber bands?

The pillars sustaining the Kansas City platform are the Solid South and Tammany Hall. The Red Shirts are indignant that the Filipinos' consent to be governed has not been obtained, and they uphold the Constitution manfully—in Luzon. Tammany Hall vigorously denounces official corruption—in Havana.

FREE RIOTS AND ANTI-MILITARISM.

The German-Americans, who are impressed by warnings against the evils and dangers of a large standing army and by praise of the National Guard as a substitute therefor, remember that the Chicago platform reaffirmed at Kansas City, in its free riot clauses caters to those who savagely denounced the American militia also; and they note that the combined effect of these attacks upon both army and militia and of practical mob rule in certain Southern states is to point not to anti-militarism, but to free riot, anarchy and the complete triumph of the forces of disorder.

The German-Americans are reasonably opposed to a large standing army and to the system of conscription and heavy taxes which such an army involves. But they are also great traders, conspicuous in all mercantile enterprises here as in Germany, and they favor any expansion which tends to build up foreign trade, provided the accompanying danger of militarism is reduced to a minimum. Of course, there is no standing army in

existence or proposed for the United States, which furnishes the slightest reasonable ground of apprehension on this score. The republic which after the civil war absorbed into civilian pursuits without the slightest jar or hitch and without the slightest perceptible danger of the supremacy of militarism eight hundred thousand soldiers hardened in the military mold by years of desperate struggle, has nothing to fear from the army, insignificant in numbers and largely enrolled to meet an emergency from civilian volunteers, which has developed from the war with Spain. The German-American, shaken in his belief in the sincerity of the anti-imperialism declarations of the Kansas City platform, is the more ready to accept the Republican claim that the G. O. P. is the true exponent of practical anti-imperialism.

TREE REPUBLICAN ANTI-IMPERIALISM.

Summarizing its anti-imperialism achievements, the Republican party may be imagined as saying :

"I freed nearly four million slaves ; I prevented the creation of a southern empire and saved to republicanism and from imperialism the Southern states ; I expelled French imperialism from Mexico ; I effected the withdrawal of Russian imperialism from Alaska ; I ejected Spanish colonial imperialism from both hemispheres ; I substituted a republic for the imperialism of a corrupt monarchy in Hawaii ; I freed the Cubans from a most oppressive and destructive form of imperialism, and will quickly enable them to enjoy in lieu thereof self-government, republican in form ; I freed the Porto Ricans from Spain's despotic imperialism, and have sent them rejoicing far along the path which leads to American self-government ; I relieved the Filipinos from the grinding, unbearable imperialism of oppressive, cruel Spain, and would long ago have blessed them with good and stable government in accordance with American precedents but for the present hateful and unnatural warfare precipitated under a misunderstanding of the American intention by the Filipinos themselves.

INSTALLING AN ASSASSIN.

"The true anti-imperialistic policy of government is not that which sets up a protectorate over our Asiatic islands, binding the republic without constitutional authority to guard against foreign attack Aguinaldo's dictatorship, a despotism buttressed by assassination, whose first independent, unrestrained act would be to murder the European friars and confiscate their alleged property, and to kill the hated Chinese. Genuine anti-imperialism demands that the republic, having struck off the chains of Spanish oppression from the Philippines, shall govern them as part of the territory belonging to the United States (a status recognized by the Constitution), through Congress (a body created by the Constitution) exercising powers defined by the Constitution and construed by the Supreme Court of the United States. Anti-imperialism consists in giving to the Filipinos, rescued from Spanish despotic rule, as full a measure of American rights, including the privilege of local self-government, as is consistent with national and territorial welfare and as is permissible in accordance with the Supreme Court's construction of the Constitution. Anti-imperialism consists in the exercise of the same powers by Congress in relation to the Asiatic and insular territory of the United States, saved from imperialism, as were exercised in dealing with Louisiana in the beginnings of national growth, and in dealing with Alaska, our latest acquisition prior to those which came to us during and after the war with Spain. Modern anti-imperialism is even more considerate of the interests of the territory belonging to the United States than that which prevailed in the earlier days. Hawaii and Porto Rico have been favored and pushed toward American self-government far more rapidly than Louisiana and Alaska. The latter waited thirty-three years and until 1900 before it reached the stage attained by Porto Rico in the very first legislation concerning that

island, and Alaska is not to-day so far advanced as the organized territory of Hawaii.

"I am for sound money and practical anti-imperialism; for anti-imperialism at home and abroad, in North Carolina as well as in Luzon. I oppose silver free coinage at 16 to 1 as an act of fraudulent bankruptcy, dishonoring the nation. I oppose government by force through Red Shirts at home and imperialistic government by American protectorates abroad. I oppose contraction of American trade in territory by cowardly abandonment under fire of any of our acquisitions from Spain. My motto is: "Prosperity at home; prestige abroad!" as opposed to "Panics at home, and a perilous pusillanimity abroad!"

PLATFORM HUMBUGGERY PERSONIFIED.

The various humbugging, vote-inviting inconsistencies which have been noted as developing in and under the Kansas City platform give to that document, as variously construed and practically applied, the aspect of groveling in the dust to beg for votes and of submitting even to the humiliation of confessing insincerity and disregard of veracity if only its mendacity may be successful. To such an extent, indeed, does this spirit permeate and characterize the document that, without any severe strain upon the imagination, the platform, personified, may be conceived as saying to American voters:

"If you are offended at anything I assert, don't believe it. I can say without either undue vanity or mock modesty that I have built up a notorious reputation which entitles me to make this request for incredulity with full confidence that it will be readily granted.

"You will remember that I made free trade the paramount issue in 1892 and won upon it, but the prophecies of evil based upon my success were not fulfilled, for I did not redeem my pledges. I adopted the Wilson tariff bill which, you will remember, was denounced by my own people as protective in principle.

DISPOSED TO SHELVE SILVER.

"In 1896 I made free silver at 16 to 1 the paramount issue to please the Populists and silver Republicans. Of course being unsuccessful, I cannot demonstrate that I was no more in earnest about free coinage than about free trade. It is significant, however, that with the conditions unchanged from 1896 except that the Republicans have identified themselves more completely than ever with the gold standard, I consider the money question as no longer paramount. I treat it as subordinate and incidental, and, outside of the perfunctory verbal reiteration of it, I am disposed to shelve it as not an issue at all.

"If by directly contradicting the money plank of the Republican platform I have inadvertently made silver free coinage the one technical, legal issue of the campaign, I am inclined rather than have words over the matter to yield and confess judgment on that issue.

"So in respect to anti-imperialism about which I have so much to say as the paramount issue to-day, no expansionist need to be alarmed. You will notice that I do not propose to abandon any of our acquisitions; that I hint at this course only in the case of the Philippines, and that even in respect to these islands I announce as the first step the provision of a stable government. I do not say that I would take any other course to establish this stable government than that followed by the Republican administration. Who can say how long it will take me to establish this stable government? Who can say that long before this stable government is established to my satisfaction the Filipinos themselves will not wish to remain annexed?

INSINCERITY OF THE BRYAN PRESS.

"A number of statesmen and newspapers support the Kansas City platform in the light of this reading and construction of it. Why may not any

expansionist do the same? The solid South, my strongest backer, produces the cotton which is the most conspicuous factor in our wonderfully-increasing Asiatic trade. The material interests of the South demand expansion, and the merest glance at conditions, in North Carolina and Louisiana, as sample states, will indicate how much solicitous care will be taken in the Philippines to secure the uncoerced consent of the dark-skinned governed.

"The independence which is suggested by me for the Filipinos is sandwiched between a preface of stable government and the postscript of a protectorate. It is to be delayed indefinitely during the unlimited period of establishing a stable government, and modified indefinitely, if it ever arrives, by a sovereignty-dividing protectorate.

"The foreign policy declared by me is viewed by some of you as pusillanimous, but I call on you to note that as the supporter of an advanced Monroe doctrine in this hemisphere which declares the republic's imperial jurisdiction over the Three Americas and throws down the gauntlet of defiance to the outside world, I go farther than the farthest, for I announce that (1) the United States has exercised and is now exercising a protectorate over the republics of Central and South America, and (2) that this protectorate is of the same order as that which the United States would exercise over territory once belonging to it to which it might grant domestic self-government. There is not much peace-loving pusillanimity in a policy which thus irritates the sensitive and jealous Spanish South Americans, and slaps the whole world in the face. Nor is there any pusillanimity in my suggestion of a war with England over the inalienable right of the Boers to govern the outlanders without the latter's consent.

ALL SORTS ARE WELCOME.

"All sorts and conditions of political opinion may gather comfortably on my declarations—free coinage and anti-free coinage voters; silver Republicans and gold Democrats; Populists and conservative anti-populist Democrats; contractionist anti-imperialists and trade and territorial expansionists; imperialists who favor a protectorate and the manifest destinarians of the advanced Monroe doctrine.

"To any class of voters whatsoever who are inclined to cast their ballots against me because they credit what I assert or seem to assert on any subject I can only say: 'Believe me, I am not to be believed.'

"Hosea Biglow has well stated my political creed:

" 'In short, I firmly du believe
 ' In Humbug generally,
 ' Fer it's a thing thet I perceive
 ' To hev a solid vally;
 ' This heth my faithful shepherd ben,
 ' In pasturs sweet heth led me,
 ' An' this'll keep the people green
 ' To feed ez they hev fed me.' "